



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/699,031	10/27/2000	Michael L Obradovich	40985/DMC/C685	6778

23363 7590 07/17/2003

CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP  
350 WEST COLORADO BOULEVARD  
SUITE 500  
PASADENA, CA 91105

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

TO, BAOQUOC N

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

2172  
DATE MAILED: 07/17/2003 11

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/699,031	OBRADOVICH, MICHAEL L	
	<b>Examiner</b> Baoquoc N To	<b>Art Unit</b> 2172	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

**A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.**

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
- 4) Claim(s) 1-7,11,13,14,16 and 22-25 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8-10,12,15 and 17-21 is/are withdrawn from consideration. *Cancelled.*  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-7,11,13,14,16 and 22-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.
- You do not  
need to show.*

**Disposition of Claims**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
 \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                              | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                     | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1, 11, and 13 are amended and newly added claims are 22-25. Claims 8, 9, 10, 12, 15, and 17-21 are canceled. Claims pending in this application are 1-7, 11, 13-14, 16 and 22-25.

***Information Disclosure Statement***

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 02/28/03. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 11 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1 and 2-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fultz (US. Patent No. 6,021,371).

Regarding on claim 1, Fultz teaches a method of populating a database comprising:

determining a tag location (user or mobile location 2) (col. 5, lines 37-38);  
requesting (inquiry) information from an external server (based station 1) concerning the tag location (mobile or user location) (col. 5, lines 38-54);  
receiving the information from the external server (auxiliary service provider 10 responds to the inquiry or request) (col. 5, lines 55-66); and  
providing the information to a computer system having a database residing in memory (col. 6, lines 11-16).

Fultz does not explicitly teach a tag location have described. However, the examiner interprets "the tag location" is a user or mobile location as describes in Fultz (col. 5, lines 36-37). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the mobile location in Fultz into "tag

location" as claimed in order to provide users with information that is specific to the user's geographical location.

Regarding on claim 2, Fultz teaches determining a tag location comprises:

Evaluating the position of a GPS capable services (col. 6, lines 17-20);

Waiting a preselected time period (col. 6, lines 17-20);

Reevaluating the position of the GPS capable service (col. 6, lines 17-20); and

Determining if the position of the GPS capable device before and after waiting the preselected time period is substantially the same (col. 6, lines 17-20).

Regarding on claim 4, Fultz teaches the tag location comprises a plurality of locations (mobile travel locations) (col. 6, lines 7-8).

Regarding on claim 5, Fultz teaches the tag location comprises a selected area (mobile location) (col. 6, lines 7-8).

Regarding on claim 6, Fultz teaches the requesting information concerning the tag location comprising:

Formatting a request identifying the selected area to a server computer system (col. 5, lines 38-39); and

Communicating the request identifying the selected area (location data) to the server computer system (col. 6, lines 7-11).

5. Claim 3 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fultz (US. Patent No. 6,021,371) in view of Sotiroff et al. (US. Patent No. 5,852,810).

Regarding on claim 3, Fultz teaches determining a tag location comprises:

presenting a map display using a computer to a user (col. 7, line 9-13);

Fultz teaches display 18 may include a touch screen for an input (col. 7, lines 17-18); however, Fultz does not explicitly teach receiving a selected position on the map display. However, Sotiroff teaches, "the user is allowed to select a more specific area, in this case a particular state 30, from the high level map by moving a point device over the area and selecting area (step 100, FIG. 6). Since the map is designated as an image map, the browser 26 returns the coordinates of the point of selected on the map" (col. 4, lines 11-17). This teaches the user selected a state by clicking on the state 30 as a selected position on the map and the coordinates are returned to the system to retrieve the area. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Sotiroff into Fultz because allowing the user to selected the specific location in the map would allow the system to retrieve the area and the reference locations as user requested.

Regarding on claim 7, Fultz teaches a method of populating the database based on the requesting information concerning the tag location as in claim 6.

Fultz does not explicitly teach the determining a tag location comprises: presenting a map display to a user, the map display providing for selection of an area of the display; receiving an indication of an area selected on the map display.

On the other hand, Sotiroff teaches presenting a map display to a user, the map display providing for selection of an area of the display (col. 4, lines 11-15); receiving an indication of an area selected on the map display (col. 4, lines 15-33).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Sotiroff into Fultz because allowing the user to select the specific location in the map would allow the system to retrieve the area and the reference locations as user requested.

6. Claims 11, 13-14 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Herz et al (US. Patent No. 5,754,938).

Regarding on claim 11, Herz teaches a method of accessing data in a database using a profile, the data comprising an indication of a geographic location and information regarding the geographic location, the method comprising:

Receiving a request for data from a database (search for target object) (col. 26, lines 17-19);

Forming search criteria for a search of the database, the search criteria including details of the request for data and details of a profile identified by the profile

identification (to search for target objects that match a search profile from a user's search profile set) (col. 26, lines 17-21); and

Locating data fulfilling the search criteria (col. 26, lines 19-21).

Herz does not explicitly teach receiving a profile identification associated with the request for data from the database, the profile identification identifying a profile, the profile being associated with a user, the user having multiple profiles associated with the user, the multiple profiles including a profile including information about the user and a standard profile. However, Herz teaches, "because people have multiple interests, for example, by consisting of a set of individual search profiles, each of which identifies one of the user's areas of interest" (col. 5, lines 19-23). In addition, Herz also teaches, "because people have multiples interests, a target profile interest summary for a single user must represent multiple areas of interest, for example, by consisting of a set of individual search profiles, each of which identifies one of the user's areas of interest. Each user is presented with those target object whose profile mostly match the user's interests as described by the user's target profile interest summary" (col. 5, lines 19-26). This teaches both user profile and the standard profile are the profile interest summary for retrieving the target objects. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include target interest summary as search parameters in order to retrieve the information based on the user multiple profiles.

Regarding on claims 13 and 23, Herz teaches the user information includes a user age (age) (col. 4, lines 47-67).

Regarding on claims 14 and 24, Herz teaches the profile includes items identified as favorites of the user (target object) (col. 4, lines 47-67).

Regarding on claim 22 is rejected same as claim 11 except for the copied of the profile. Herz teaches, "One use of these searching techniques is to search for target objects that match a search profile from a user's search profile set" (col. 26, lines 17-19). In addition, Herz also teaches, "each user is presented with those target objects whose profiles most closely match the user's interests as described by the user's target profile interest summary" (col. 5, lines 23-26). Since the claims is not defining clearly on "copied profile" the examiner equates as a profile. Herz discloses the multiples profile set uses to retrieve the target of interest. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include multiple user profile to search in order to retrieve information that related to user's profiles.

7. Claims 16 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Herz et al (US. Patent No. 5,754,938) in view of Reese (US. Patent No. 6,374,237).

Regarding on claims 16 and 25, Herz teaches modifying user profile by the server except a request for modification of details of a profile, and modifying the profile in response to the request for modification of details of the profile. However, Reese teaches, "the client prompts (step 260) the user to modify the user profile request. If the user wish to modify the user profile request, the client can send the modified user profile to the matching server to conduct a further search of the content sites" (col. 4, lines 22-27). This teaches the user is prompt for choice of modifying the user profile and if so the modified user profile is sent to the server to conduct the search. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Reese into Herz because allowing the user to request to modify the user profile and using the modified profile to search would retrieve the result much relevance to the users.

***Conclusion***

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

***Contact Information***

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Baoquoc N. To whose telephone number is (703) 305-1949 or via e-mail BaoquocN.To@uspto.gov. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday: 8:00 AM – 4:30 PM, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Y. Vu can be reached at (703) 305-4393.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231.

The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follow:

- (703) 746-7238 [After Final Communication}]
- (703) 746-7239 [Official Communication]
- (703) 746-7240 [Non-Official Communication]

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:

Crystal Park II  
2121 Crystal Drive  
Arlington, VA 22202  
Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

Baoquoc N. To  
July 6, 2003

*Shahid Alam*  
SHAHID AL ALAM  
PATENT EXAMINER